



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,642	03/30/2001	Tak M. Mak	042390P11281	6923

7590 04/10/2003

Michael A. Bernadicou
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

LE, THONG QUOC

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2818

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

Appli ant(s)

09/823,642

MAK ET AL.

Examiner

Art Unit

Thong Q. L.

2818

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) 18 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Amendment filed on July 02, 2002 has been entered.
2. Claims 1-18 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Drawings

4. The corrected or substitute drawings were received on June 20, 2001. These drawings are acceptable.

Specification

5. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Figure 2a and Figure 2b substituted Figure 2, accordance with substitute drawings. Therefore, the Figure 2 has to be deleted.

Page 4, line 6, should be change "Figure 2 is block diagrams " to – Figure 2a and Figure 2b are block diagrams—

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
7. Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See

Art Unit: 2818

MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: the connection between bit lines and multiplexer in comparators of Figure 2b as disclosed in claims 17-18.

As described in Figure 2b, the second bit line 276 coupled to MUX 284, then output of MUX 284 coupled to input of comparator 244. The second bit line is not coupled to comparator 244 as claim disclosing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito (U.S. Patent No. 5,708,598) as applied to claims 17-18 above, and further in view of Sung (U. S. Patent No. 6,353,568).

Regarding claims 17, Saito discloses a comparator (Figure 2, 104B).

Saito as described above, fails to disclose a sticky latch. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a sticky latch coupled output of comparator. Applicant has not disclosed that the sticky latch provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with either the controller 130 in Figure 1 of Saito or in any type of latch coupling to output of comparator, because the controller or any type of

Art Unit: 2818

latch perform their function of receiving data from comparator and transferring data as sticky latch performing.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in this art to modify the sticky latch in Figure 1 of Sung to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 1-16 are allowed.

Claims 1-16 include allowable subject matter since the prior art made of record and considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure does not teach or suggest the claimed limitations. Saito (U.S. Patent No. 5,708,598), and others, does not teach the claimed invention having a second comparator circuit 240 coupled to the second 276 and fourth bit lines 272 to compare a voltage level on the second bit line with a voltage level on the fourth bit line at a time when the complement of the data that is output on the first 274 and third bit lines 270 is output from the first memory cell on the second bit line and from the second memory cell 212 on the fourth bit line.

11. Claim 18 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 18 include allowable subject matter since the prior art made of record and considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure does not teach or suggest the claimed limitations. Saito (U.S. Patent No. 5,708,598), Sung (U.S. Patent No. 6,353,568), and others, does not teach the claimed invention having a comparator circuit coupled to a

Art Unit: 2818

MUX 224 to disconnect the second bit line 276 and connected to a third bit line 270 that is coupled to the first memory cell in the memory array 210.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thong Q. Le whose telephone number is 703-306-9123. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David C. Nelms can be reached on 703-308-4910. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9318 for regular communications and 703-872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-3329.



Thong Q. Le
Examiner
Art Unit 2818

April 3, 2003